# Week5

1. body exists and is essentially extended
2. sensory and imagination are caused under outside force
3. mind > body
4. caused by outside force
5. one container/unit of mind and senses
6. body exists in outside world
7. but he is only his mind

For Descartes, there is no real distinction between physics and geometry and between bodies and empty space.  Analogy

body exists and is essentially extended

He claims to perceive clearly and distinctly that the primary attribute of body is extension. His arguments from the imagination and the senses are supposed to show that his intellectual faculties seem to be linked to something outside of the mind.

1. In Meditation 6 Descartes argues for the real distinction between mind and body. What does he mean by a 'real distinction' and how does he argue for it?

Body – extension. body is extended but mind is not.

How:

He thinks it not unreasonable to suppose that these perceptions all come from some outside source. They come to him involuntarily, and they are so much more vivid than the perceptions he consciously creates in his own mind.

Stomach tug – hungry 🡪 senses are passive faculty

Thousand shape figure 🡪 imagination vs intellect

The imagination cannot be an essential property of his mind, since the Meditator could still exist even if he could not imagine. Therefore, the imagination must rely on something other than the mind for its existence.

Not just conceptually distinct

Capable of existing independently of each other

Method of doubt

I cannot doubt A is on stage

I can doubt B is on stage

* A != B

A bad method (A and B are actually the same)

D: “I can doubt body, I cannot doubt mind so they are different”

My ability to doubt does not reflect sth is true.

Conceptual analysis becomes metaphysical analysis

1. The distinction between mind and body notoriously leads to the so called mind/body problem. What does this problem consist in, and does Descartes have any resources to address it?

How can they interact? Materialism. Baron D’holbach “System of nature”

Idealism. World is all of mindness, world is a collection of small minds. Leibniz => Pan-psychism Berkeley

Spinoza: Logical Relations (Mind) – (Body) Causal Relations

Just a relations of correspondence

Determinist: “Every event is determined by an antecedent cause” -> “compatibilism”: “moral responsibility”

Necessitist: “Things couldn’t be other than they are” No other possibilities

John McDowell: Perception that puts you in direct contact with the world, which is not what you generate in the mind

1. Is there any relation between the skeptical arguments from the first meditation, and Descartes' substance dualism?

First, he clearly and distinctly perceives that he is, in essence, only a thinking thing. Body is essentially extended and mind is non-extended, so he can conclude that he really is distinct from his body and could exist without it. Mind > Imagination (can live w/o imagination but needs mind to contain imagination)

All these facts combine to suggest that sometimes the body is incapable of sending the right message to the mind.

The Meditator concludes that, on the whole, he can be quite certain of things that he had cast into doubt in the First Meditation. The senses are normally quite adequate in helping us get around in the world, and when in doubt, we can double-check our sensory perceptions with our intellect or our memory. The Meditator also notes that our memory can dispel the doubt presented in the Dream Argument. Any waking experience can be connected through memory to all other waking experiences, whereas in dreams, things happen in a disconnected and somewhat random manner. Since God is not a deceiver, the Meditator is safe from erroneous judgment as long as he applies her mind carefully.

“Equipped for judgement”

1. In his Ethics, Spinoza offers a solution to the mind/body problem. What is it, and is it at all plausible?